ase 4:18-cv-05109-SMJ ECF No. 192 filed 09/30/19 PageID.8161 Page 1 of 6

PLAINTIFF'S REPLY RE: MOTION TO SEAL Case No. 4:18-cv-05109-SMJ

20

Defendant does not oppose the motion to seal Exhibits 10, 74 and 75 attached to the Declaration of Mark Rose, stating that "[c]onsistent with the Court's Order Granting Defendant's Motion to Seal Documents Dated September 16, 2019 (EFC No. 151), Defendant respectfully requests that the Court grant [the] pending motion to seal to protect Defendant's confidential and security-sensitive information." ECF No. 156.

In response to the prior motion to seal, the Court considered Plaintiff's objections to sealing the draft Cause Analysis Report for Payment to a Fraudulent Subcontractor, which is one of the documents at issue again here. *See* ECF No. 148. In the context of that earlier motion to seal, the Court found that this "set of proposed sealed documents contains security-sensitive information related to U.S. Department of Energy programs involving Defendant[,]" found "a compelling need for confidentiality supported by these specific facts, and conclude[d] this need outweighs the public's interest in disclosure." *See Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178–79 (9th Cir. 2006)." ECF No. 151.

Plaintiff recognizes that the Court may well reach the same conclusion in response to the present motion, since part of the evidence at issue here (*i.e.*, Rose Dec., Exhibits 74 and 75) address similar documents—albeit not the same evidence.

PLAINTIFF'S REPLY RE: MOTION TO SEAL - 1 Case No. 4:18-cv-05109-SMJ

The documents are similar to the extent that the present motion to seal concerns, in part, drafts of the Cause Analysis Report for Payment to a Fraudulent Subcontractor. *See* ECF No. 132 and 132-1 (Rose Dec., Exhibits 74 and 75). It differs from the earlier motion and the previously sealed documents in that the draft reports now at issue contain handwritten edits by Steve Cooke, which show that "[p]rior to Mr. Cooke working with Mr. Conger to change the language of the root cause statement, Mr. Cooke had twice reviewed and edited earlier drafts of the March root cause statement, and had not changed the substantive language of the root cause statement." *See* SDMF 12 (ECF No. 135 at 13:12-17), citing Rose Dec., Exhibit 74 (ECF No. 132) and Exhibit 75 (ECF No. 132-1).

The fact that Steve Cooke made handwritten edits to the draft report that did not alter or change the language of the root cause statement is relevant to

Defendant's dispositive motion. Much of the defense's argument (including the root cause modifications) is public in the summary judgment filing and will be at a public trial. In considering the sealing of these documents at summary judgment, sealing should be denied because the public has a right to know and see that PNNL Attorney Steve Cooke did not see fit to change the March root cause analysis in two edits he did in March. He only saw fit to change the root cause later when Manager Marty Conger objected to the March root cause language.

20 |

PLAINTIFF'S REPLY RE: MOTION TO SEAL - 2 Case No. 4:18-cv-05109-SMJ

Since the draft cause report has already been a part of the public record for two years, *see* ECF No. 149, ¶3, Plaintiff submits there is no compelling need to seal the documents showing Mr. Cooke's handwritten edits, and she incorporates by reference her previously stated objections to sealing the draft cause analysis reports. *See* ECF No. 148.

The third proposed sealed document, Rose Dec., Ex. 10, is a three-page excerpt from a Corrective Action Plan, issued in 2007, which is unrelated to the fraudulent payment and causal analysis at issue in this case. The excerpt from the 2007 corrective action plan describes, *inter alia*, some of the root causes identified in a different cause analysis, but does not provide detailed facts of the type found in draft cause reports previously sealed by the Court. See ECF No. 132-2. For such reason, the arguments Defendant presented for sealing the draft causal analysis report—claiming that the Fowler draft causal analysis report "explore[s] in ... granular factual detail ... system vulnerabilities," and claiming that it "could ... be used to attempt a similar fraudulent scheme against PNNL")—has no application to Rose Dec., Ex. 10. As Defendant has offered no evidence or argument in support of finding compelling reasons to seal the Corrective Action Plan excerpt, the Court should not seal the document.

DATED this 30th day of September, 2019.

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

PLAINTIFF'S REPLY RE: MOTION TO SEAL - 3 Case No. 4:18-cv-05109-SMJ

THE SHERIDAN LAW FIRM, P.S. 1 2 By: s/John P. Sheridan John P. Sheridan, WSBA # 21473 Mark W. Rose, WSBA # 41916 Hoge Building, Suite 1200 705 Second Avenue 3 Seattle, WA 98104 Phone: 206-381-5949 4 Fax: 206-447-9206 5 jack@sheridanlawfirm.com mark@sheridanlawfirm.com 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 17 I certify that on September 30, 2019, I electronically filed the above 18 and foregoing pleading using the CM/ECF System. Notice of Electronic 19 20 SHERIDAN LAW FIRM, P.S. PLAINTIFF'S REPLY RE: Hoge Building, Suite 1200 MOTION TO SEAL - 4 705 Second Avenue Case No. 4:18-cv-05109-SMJ Seattle, WA 98104

Tel: 206-381-5949 Fax: 206-447-9206

1	Filing was provided to the following counsel:	
2	Mark Nelson Bartlett	
3	Gillian Murphy Arthur Simpson DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP	
4	1201 Third Avenue, Suite 220 Seattle, Washington 98101	
5	Attorneys for Defendant	
6	Muorneys for Defendant	
7		s/Mark Rose
8		Mark Rose, WSBA # 41916
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		CHEDIDANI AW FIDM D.C.
	PLAINTIFF'S REPLY RE: MOTION TO SEAL - 5	SHERIDAN LAW FIRM, P.S. Hoge Building, Suite 1200 705 Second Avenue

Case No. 4:18-cv-05109-SMJ

Flore Building, Suite 1200 705 Second Avenue Seattle, WA 98104 Tel: 206-381-5949 Fax: 206-447-9206